

AGENDA as of Monday November 15, 2004
Solid Waste Management Task Force

11/15/2004 7:00 PM WELCOME, TASK FORCE BUSINESS

William Lecos, Chairman
JR Holt, Group Facilitator
Dan Jackson & Colin Waitt, LMI

7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES REVIEW

GDS facilitator discusses collaborative technology environment & roles of participants, Chairman, facilitation team.

7:20 PM ICE BREAKER

BOS Expectations of the Solid Waste Task Force Report

7:25 PM CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

Discuss and make decisions on Customer Service issues.

8:25 PM BREAK

8:35 PM OPERATIONS ISSUES

Discuss and make decisions on Operations issues.

9:30 PM OTHER ISSUES

9:50 PM SESSION FEEDBACK

Please provide us with feedback on the effectiveness of the session.

10:00 PM ADJOURN MEETING

See you on November 30 in the GDSC.

ROLES AND GROUND RULES

MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

1. PURPOSE:
 - Use collaborative technology to work through Customer Service and Operations Issues
2. SCOPE:
 - Customer Service and Operations issues previously identified and prioritized
3. MEETING OBJECTIVE:
 - Complete discussion and make decisions about Customer Service issues
 - Begin discussion of Operations issues
4. SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!

1. CHAIRMAN
 - Participate as Task Force member
 - Officiate over voting results
 - Oversee meeting
2. Responsible for CONTENT
3. PARTICIPATE actively
4. REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate
5. YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

FACILITATION TEAM

1. Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)
2. Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION
3. Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS
4. Maintains meeting PACE
5. Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES
6. Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.
7. STARTS and STOPS participants in the software
8. CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges
9. Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

GROUND RULES

1. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE VERY FAST! We have 10 issues to consider in about 120 minutes.
2. USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions
3. The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION"
4. Be COURTEOUS
5. Do not INTERRUPT
6. Stay FOCUSED on the Task Force interests.

7. Look beyond the "BOTTOM LINE" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.
8. Keep MOVING FORWARD -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.
9. Don't get your feelings HURT.
10. Appointed Task Force MEMBERS will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed.
11. If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "PARKING LOT" -- but very sparingly.

CONSENSUS

1. Everyone has INPUT
2. Have a GENERAL UNDERSTANDING of ideas and discussions
3. Select the group's PREFERRED course of action
4. Usually NOT unanimous or complete agreement

SIGN-IN

1. Please click on the PLUS BUTTON icon at the top left to add your name to our sign-in list.

ICEBREAKER

1. What do you believe is the single most important EXPECTATION of the Board of Supervisors for the Task Force Report?

(Double click on this question to add your ONE comment)

CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

CONTRACTING WITH COLLECTORS

1. Currently there are no guidelines for assisting HOAs and private groups for CONTRACTING WITH PRIVATE COLLECTORS.
2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to developing guidance for HOAs and private groups for contracting with private haulers? Why or why not?
3. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?
4. What kinds of items need to be addressed in the guidelines? Why?

STRATEGY FOR EMERGENCIES

1. Presently, there is no County Code with respect to solid waste services during or following emergencies. If an "official" emergency is declared, the County has defined emergency plans in place for cleaning up roadways, public spaces and emergency access. Even if an official emergency is declared, current plans do not address the removal of residential waste or debris on private property.
2. What are all the different types and levels of emergencies that impact solid waste collection?
3. What are the appropriate roles for the COUNTY to fill during EMERGENCIES which have not been declared to be "official?"
4. What are the appropriate roles for HAULERS to fill during EMERGENCIES which have not been declared to be "official?"
5. Should the Task Force develop recommendations for roles and responsibilities when emergencies affect solid waste collection? Why or why not?
6. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS

1. Nothing exists today that defines quality standards for customer service for residential collection beyond the minimum Code requirements.
2. Is there a value for haulers to create a voluntary CHARTER FOR CUSTOMER SERVICE that would set out the services to be provided to customers?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

COMPETITION

1. Is there sufficient private COMPETITION in the marketplace to sustain high levels of customer service in Fairfax County? Why or why not?
2. What are the main issues with respect to ensuring COMPETITION among the private haulers?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

COMMUNICATION

1. County Code requires that collectors communicate with their customers but does not define frequency. Minimal content is currently required (Section 109-4-1(i)) of the communication.
2. What are some of the issues with respect to residential waste collection COMMUNICATION?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to the frequency or content of COMMUNICATIONS between customers and haulers? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

****** OPERATIONS ISSUES ******

COMBINED: COUNTY OUT OF DIRECT WASTE REMOVAL & CONTRACT ALL OPERATIONS OF SANITARY DISTRICTS

1. The County currently collects waste and special collections from about 43,000 homes or about 15% of the homes in the County and vacuum leaf collection for approximately 22,000 customers. Supervisor Kaufmann asked that the consequences of the County getting out of direct waste collections be evaluated.
2. What are the POSITIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?
3. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to RESIDENTS of the County ending its waste collection operations?
4. What are the POSITIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?
5. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to HAULERS of the County ending its waste collection operations?
6. What are the POSITIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?
7. What are the NEGATIVE consequences to the COUNTY of ending its waste collection operations?
8. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation on whether the County should continue to collect solid waste, special collections and vacuum leaves? Why or why not?
9. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

1. Supervisor Kauffman also asked that Chapter 109 be more rigorously enforced. The County currently is responsible for Chapter 109 of the Code. Recommendations of this Task Force will probably require changes to the Code.
2. What changes need to be made to the Code?
3. What strategies of enforcement should this Task Force recommend?

UNIFIED RECYCLING ACTIVITIES

1. The Solid Waste Management Plan adopted by the BOS specifies that additional materials (mixed paper, plastic bottles, cardboard) be collected curbside. Haulers will be required to collect these materials.

2. How should this change to recycling be implemented – all at once, or one material at a time?
3. What are the issues with respect to educating residents as to the new recycling requirements?
4. Should the County take the lead in developing recycling outreach materials or should the individual haulers? Why or why not?

PROCUREMENT OF COUNTY CONTRACTS

1. The County's procurement system is established under authority from the State. State and County procurement rules and procedures allows for additional service areas to be added to a contract by mutual agreement without recompeting. It is the County's policy to use the existing contract instead of developing a new contract for each new sanitary district that is added. This process saves on solicitation costs (estimated to exceed \$30,000 per solicitation in terms of staff and contractors' time) and additional work throughout the County's procurement system. Procurement law does not constrain the number of awards that can be won by a single company.
2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation concerning the County procurement process? Why or why not?
3. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

DIFFICULTY OF INSPECTIONS AND PERMITTING OF VEHICLES

1. County requires that all solid waste collection vehicles be permitted on an annual basis.
2. What are the issues regarding solid waste vehicle permitting?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation about this issue? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

HIGH BOND AMOUNTS

1. County requires an assurance bond of \$10,000 per truck collecting solid waste in Fairfax County.
2. What are the issues regarding assurance bonds?
3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation about assurance bonds? Why or why not?
4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

SESSION FEEDBACK

1. What went well tonight?
2. What didn't go well?
3. Other comments?

Minutes
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TASK FORCE
November 15, 2004, 7:00 - 10:00 p.m.
Group Decision Support Center (GDSC)
Pennino Building, 3rd Floor

Attendees: Jim Langemeier, Joyce Doughty, Joyce Bissonette, Bill Lecos, Joan Carr, Conrad Mehan, Paul Liberty, Clark Tyler, John Hasle, Sheila Roit, Joann McCoy

Members Absent : Robin Smyers, Queenie Cox, Marilyn Blois*, Peter Crane, John Townes

Staff: Jeff Smithberger, Marilyn McHugh, Christina Lunsford, Pamela Gratton, and Linda Boone

LMI: Colin Waitt

Facilitator: J.R. Holt

Guests: Pat Sanborn, Larry Edwards, Dana Alashi

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:03, when a quorum was present. The Minutes of the October 26, 2004 meeting were approved as presented.

The Chairman turned the meeting to J.R. Holt, the facilitator, who quickly reviewed the GDSC technology and the ground rules of the Task Force for addressing the customer service and operations issues previously identified.

Jeff Smithberger took several photos of the members using the GDSC. All Task Force members present agreed to allow their photos to be published on the webpage or in the final report.

Ice Breaker

The ice breaker and demonstration question was; What do you believe is the single most important expectation of the Board of Supervisors for the Task Force Report?

The results of this and other issues, discussion and votes are captured in the attached GDSC Report - SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT FROM NOVEMBER 15TH MEETING, dated November 15, 2004.

*NOTE: Marilyn Blois provided written comments to the issue questions since she was out of town for the meeting. Linda Boone added these comments as appropriate to the following issues.

Contracting with Collectors

Discussion: In response to the question about whether the Task Force should make a recommendation with respect to developing guidance for homeowners' associations (HOAs) and private groups for contracting with private haulers, members indicated in a vote of 6 No, 1 perhaps, and 4 yes that the Task Force wanted to leave this as an issue to be developed between collection companies and their customers.

Some thoughts were that the County should not be in the business of helping HOAs contract at all; not a good use of County resources. Others thought it would be a great service for the County to provide. It was suggested that there were private associations such as Community Association Institute (CAI), whose purpose was to help HOAs.

Recommendation: No further recommendation from Task Force

Strategies for Emergencies

Discussion: The discussion varied on the questions. Many members thought it was difficult to make decisions on the recommendations since there were questions about declared and undeclared emergencies or disasters, the type of emergencies (weather, natural, man –made, terrorists, etc), whether the County would pay collectors or lift disposal restrictions for help provided by private companies, any many others. Most agreed that garbage and trash related to health and safety issues should be removed and disposed quickly by the regular trash services. The collectors stated that brush removal and recycling should not be a priority in a widespread disaster. Others thought brush was the main problem in many weather related disasters. Collectors stated they are not tree companies and are not equipped to handle massive amounts of brush.

Collectors stated they look at it from the community perspective and will support their customers to the extent of their equipment and resources; however the County could relax restrictions and tip fees to be supportive of unplanned events.

There are lots of issues about debris removal that are not trash issues. When the County declares a state of emergency, haulers need to know what to do—recycling and brush can be deferred until the emergency is lifted. The County could be the lead on the emergency. Marilyn McHugh read from the County’s Emergency Plan about the appointment of a debris removal coordinator, who can tell haulers what is happening and work with them to maximize their efforts. The plan for what should happen in various emergencies/disasters should be stated prior to any emergencies.

It was the sense of the Task Force that the County should be the central coordination and communication conduit for declared and undeclared emergencies. The County would pull in collectors as needed to have a coordinated cleanup effort. Collectors would provide whatever additional capacity they had after serving their customers to help with general community cleanup efforts.

Trash collectors wanted input to the County’s development of these plans –they want to provide trash services but are not equipped to provide tree or CDD removal services. Most Task Force members wanted to work with Collectors at their quarterly meetings to further develop detailed solutions to emergency coordination and trash removal planning. The County has an emergency alert system and haulers could be part of that communication option, just by signing up for it.

Recommendation: John Hasle agreed to work with the Collectors on this initiative to develop their input to be used by the County in disaster/emergency planning.

Service Level Agreements

Discussion. Since this is a voluntary set of standards that collectors would subscribe to, the collectors should decide what are the core service quality/standards that collectors would market to their customers.

Seven members agreed there was value for haulers to create a voluntary charter for customer service that would set out the services to be provided to customers. Five members did not see the value (including all the collectors).

Recommendation: In a 7 Yes , 4 No vote, it was agreed that a subcommittee of the Task Force would work on the service charter and discuss it with the Collectors at their January meeting. Conrad Mehan will take this matter to the collectors.

Competition

Discussion: The Task Force discussed the pros and cons of competition within the County. Residents already have various options for disposing of trash – private collectors, taking trash to a County disposal facility, or asking to become a sanitary district.

Recommendation: The Task Force does not want to make a further recommendation about competition at this time. The free market will ensure there are competitive service options for residents.

Communication

Discussion: Is there a legal requirement for official notices to be made in languages other than English? Marilyn McHugh will research this.

This is another area that could be covered in a voluntary quality statement or charter that collectors subscribe to. Currently Chapter 109 states some minimum communication that must occur between collectors and their customers. This seems adequate if collectors really do it.

Chapter 109-4-3 states that collectors must have a staffed office to answer phones. Is an phone answering system OK? Yes, since more and more that is how many businesses handle incoming calls. Responding to calls may be more relevant to communication than frequency or content. If companies are not answering calls, then customers can go to another company.

Recommendation:

The Task Force voted to make no additional recommendations with respect to the frequency or content of communications between customers and haulers?

The vote meter was used to address the question about whether customers should be able to contact the County and private haulers during normal business hours and get a response within one business day? The response was unanimously 11 in favor of that strategy for the final report or for use in the development of the quality service standard/charter.

Other issues

The Chairman asked members to identify any issues, areas, or focus of interest that this Task Force needs to consider while we have access to the GDSC?

The responses from the GDSC software to this question follow:

” What is the appropriate role of the county in solid waste management over the next twenty years. {#798}

What are the consequences of the county not providing direct resident solid waste services? {#799}

We haven't addressed how a company that is not performing up to minimal standards required by county code is dealt with. What can be done to require their compliance in order to avoid draconian action by the BOS. {#800}

To define the precise role of the county in the trash collection business - procurement, oversight, selecting haulers for districts, park-outs, public buildings etc. {#801}

Are there enough haulers to pick up the slack if the County gets out of the business and/or are the current ones prepared to grow to handle this? {#802}

I would like to see the Task Force focus on the following:

1. What can be done by those in the room who provide collection services to decrease emissions within the next five years.
 2. What can be done to increase the safety of the citizens while collection trucks are in the neighborhoods?
 3. What can be done to increase the amount of recycling by private citizens in regard to curbside pick up.?
 4. What can be done to control the amount of hazardous material in household collections? i.e., NiCAD batteries, florescent bulbs, etc. {#803, Other Attendee}
- The goal of this group is to a little or do a lot, but certainly we can't do nothing. We need to do something really forward thinking. We need to build for the future, such as significantly increasing the capacity of the E/RRF, i.e., double its size. We need to act like the folks that were forward thinking in the 1980's that first saw the vision for building the facility.

This issue is beyond the trash left behind by various hauler, the size of yard debris, or paper vs. plastic. It is critical to managing a county on its way to 2 million citizens. {#804}

ditto to #800 {#805}

Yes, we are not thinking as far ahead as we should be - 20 years. {#806}

No real recommendations on service quality, This was the main reason for group. Can be through a code change or less preferably through a voluntary program. {#807}

#802 is a key question. {#808}

What incentive is there to provide good service? Can the County pull a lic. to operate if there is no quality service? {#809, Other Attendee}

Comment to #804 - The SWMP approved by the BOS did not call for increasing the size of the E/RRF. With current air regulations it would be nearly impossible to expand the facility - as Northern Virginia is in an area that would make that nearly impossible. {#810, County Staff}

Level playing fields for small haulers to compete for county contracts. County permitting and bonding. Sanitation districts. {#812}"

Discussion items that were offered include:

Need to see how County collects waste. Do they have lots of equipment?

Where are we on the 5-year notice? Where is county into competition and procurement?

Purpose of the Task Force.

Evaluate and report on County's role in residential waste collection.

Concerns of small haulers

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Next meeting – November 30, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the Group Decision Support Center, Pennino Building, 3rd Floor

Attachment: SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT FROM NOVEMBER 15TH MEETING, dated November 15, 2004.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE REPORT FROM NOVEMBER 15TH MEETING

Monday, November 15, 2004

Agenda - SWMTF - Agenda for November 15th Meeting	3
ROLES AND GROUND RULES	4
MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE	4
PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!	4
FACILITATION TEAM	4
GROUND RULES	4
CONSENSUS	5
SIGN-IN	5
ICEBREAKER	6
FINISH CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES	7
*** CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES ***	7
CONTRACTING WITH COLLECTORS	7
STRATEGY FOR EMERGENCIES	8
SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS	11
COMPETITION	12
COMMUNICATION	14
OTHER ISSUES	15
*** FEEDBACK ***	16

Agenda - SWMTF - Agenda for November 15th Meeting

11/15/2004

7:00 PM WELCOME BACK ON NOVEMBER 15th

William Lecos, Chairman

JR Holt, Group Facilitator

Linda Boone, Fairfax County

Dan Jackson & Colin Waitt, LMI

7:10 PM ROLES AND GROUND RULES

GDS facilitator discusses collaborative technology environment & roles of participants, Chairman, facilitation team.

7:25 PM FINISH CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

Discuss and make decisions on the remaining Customer Service issues.

8:25 PM BREAK

8:40 PM CONTINU CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

Discuss and make decisions on Operations issues.

9:30 PM OTHER ISSUES

9:55 PM SESSION FEEDBACK

Please provide us with feedback on the effectiveness of the session.

10:00 PM ADJOURN MEETING

See you on November 30 to finish the Operations issues.

ROLES AND GROUND RULES

MEETING PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

1. PURPOSE:

-- Use collaborative technology to finish working through issues related to Customer Service and to begin working on Operational issues.

2. SCOPE:

-- Five remaining Customer Service issues

-- Eight Operational issues

3. MEETING OBJECTIVE:

-- Complete discussion and make decisions about Customer Service and Operational issues

4. SESSION OUTPUT (edited) will be disseminated as basis of meeting minutes.

PARTICIPANTS & CHAIRMAN - YOU!

1. CHAIRMAN

-- Participate as Task Force member

-- Officiate over voting results

-- Oversee meeting

2. Responsible for CONTENT

3. PARTICIPATE actively

4. REPRESENT your IDEAS and your constituents' perspectives as appropriate

5. YOU JOINTLY OWN THE PRODUCT OF THE MEETING!

FACILITATION TEAM

1. Responsible for the PROCESS of the meeting (FACILITATES)

2. Ensures EQUAL PARTICIPATION

3. Deals with GROUP DYNAMICS

4. Maintains meeting PACE

5. Ensures COMPLETION of ACTIVITIES

6. Is the INTERFACE between the participants and the technology.

7. STARTS and STOPS participants in the software

8. CONTROLS the SOFTWARE, gives and takes away participant privileges

9. Provides all TECHNICAL SUPPORT (hardware, software, network)

GROUND RULES

1. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE VERY FAST! We have 10 issues to consider in about 120 minutes.

2. USE THE TECHNOLOGY to record and/or capture ideas/opinions before we have verbal discussions

3. The meeting is "NON-ATTRIBUTION / NON-RETRIBUTION"

4. Be COURTEOUS

5. Do not INTERRUPT

6. Stay **FOCUSED** on the Task Force interests.
7. Look beyond the "**BOTTOM LINE**" to make sure we are achieving what the majority of Task Force members have chosen.
8. Keep **MOVING FORWARD** -- Don't wait for the 100% solution.
9. Don't get your feelings **HURT**.
10. Appointed Task Force **MEMBERS** will input information into the computers anonymously. Other attendees will have their ideas attributed.
11. If we can't come to consensus at this meeting, we will use the "**PARKING LOT**" -- but very sparingly.

CONSENSUS

1. Everyone has **INPUT**
2. Have a **GENERAL UNDERSTANDING** of ideas and discussions
3. Select the group's **PREFERRED** course of action
4. Usually **NOT** unanimous or complete agreement

SIGN-IN

1. Double click here to add your name

Paul Liberty {#128}
Jeffrey Smithberger {#129, County Staff}
Sheila M. Roit, RN {#130}
Joyce Doughty {#131}
Bill Lecos {#132}
Joyce Bissonette {#133}
Marilyn McHugh {#134, County Staff}
Joan Carr {#135}
Jim Langemeier {#136}
JR Holt {#137, FACILITATOR}
Clark Tyler {#138}
Conrad Mehan {#139}
John Hasle {#140}
Colin Waitt {#141, Other Attendee}
Pat Sanborn {#142, Other Attendee}
Catherine Lunsford {#144, Other Attendee}
Pamela Gratton {#145, Other Attendee}
Linda Boone {#146, County Staff}
Joann McCoy {#157}
Dana Alashi (Other Attendee)

ICEBREAKER

1. What do you believe is the single most important expectation of the Board of Supervisors for the Task Force Report?

Ability of task force to recommend solutions to issues raised throughout the year and at the recent public hearing. {#147}

A picture of how trash, recycling, will be conducted in the next 20 years {#148}

A fair plan with competition. {#149}

Resolve issues that brought us here in the first place to maintain and improve current system {#150}

create a set of procedures and rules that eliminates service problems for the citizens {#151}

The single most important expectatiojn is that the report will make a recommendation defining the county's role in solid waste management over the next twenty years. {#152}

To develop a far-reaching plan to deal with near-term solid waste concerns such as hauler fees, customer expectations and long-term goals such as doubling the size of the mass burn facility. Each goal is to meet the needs of citizens today and tomorrow. {#153}

To define the county's precise role in solid waste management - particularly to come up with an alternative to the proposal to take over residential trash collection. {#154}

we produce a report with substance/teeth to bring about better service for the consumer {#155}

Recommendations will be made that help resolve many of the issues raised as concerns by the public, and discussed in the Solid Waste Plan. {#156}

FINISH CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

**** CUSTOMER SERVICE ****

CONTRACTING WITH COLLECTORS

1. Currently there are no guidelines for assisting HOAs and private groups for CONTRACTING WITH PRIVATE COLLECTORS.

2. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to developing guidance for HOAs and private groups for contracting with private haulers? Why or why not?

No - DSW should provide info about code requirements and options without becoming involved in the contracting or negotiating process. {#620}

No, all hoa's have boards that handle this task and it is up to the individual board to do the research. {#626}

No. The County should not be in the biz to regulate how HOAs etc contract for services. The County CAN and SHOULD set some parameters as to the minimal level of service that an INDIVIDUAL can expect from service providers. {#619}

No. It is up to the HOA or private groups to develop their own set of standards. {#624}

No. The needs of the HOA's are so varied that a uniform set of guidelines would be inappropriate. {#616}

No. This customer base was never an issue that came to the Board. Subscription service was the issue before the Board that brought the task force to being. We shouldn't add another issue to our agenda. {#618}

Perhaps, guidelines would be helpful, stating requirements established by County for private haulers. Guidelines would be to be wide ranging. {#627}

Yes, if HOA's could be provided with some guidelines they and their communities would be better informed of the minimum level of service they can expect by law and the level they contracted for with their hauler. {#615}

Yes, the task force can provide some framework for guidance, but that is all it will be ---guidance. A way to disseminate the information will also be needed. {#623}

Yes. To provide consistency and a fair price. {#617}

Yes. Most HOA's have volunteer Boards who may not be familiar with contracting procedures or evaluation of minimum services. {#621}

DISCUSSION:

-- "Guidelines" was not meant to mean "regulations."

-- Might be a good thing to educate HOAs who sometimes don't know how to contract.

-- This is no different than any other service HOAs need -- county do it for all services?

-- If do it for HOAs, also do it for other citizens? Not a good use of county funds. {#628, FACILITATOR}

3. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

Establish a sub-committee to work on establishment of this document. Group should not have more than 3-4 members with at least 1 hauler in participation. Marilyn Blois would be willing serve if needed.] {#622}

4. What kinds of items need to be addressed in the guidelines? Why?

1. Contact info for all haulers including the area they currently service.

2. How to go about petitioning to become a sanitary district served by the County.

3. What % of guaranteed business in a neighborhood generally enables an HOA to get a "discount" or special services.
4. How an individual homeowner would go about contracting w/a hauler.
5. A clear definition of what constitutes basic service and what constitutes special pick-ups and what type of service is NEVER provided.
6. Where an HOA or individual could go to find current hauler rates for normal and special services.
7. What a "contract" provides, not only in the way of services, but what to do and whom to contact if problems, such as special pickups, are required.
8. Definition of what constitutes: regular, special, leaf, tree & brush, etc. service.
9. Who to call, for "toxic" item removal and costs especially if it is not your contracted hauler.
10. What the hauler agrees to do re: answering customer calls, returning calls, replacement trash bins, holiday schedules, rate increase notification, payment options, website address, missed pickups, etc.
11. A "reminder" list from the hauler listing the things they have found from experience that customers generally forget to do -- basically things that could make a haulers life a little easier.
12. A general explanation on current County requirements for recycling so that a customer knows that it is not just the hauler making up the rules as they go along.
13. Reasons why service might be delayed, such as icy roads or road construction and when a customer can expect trash removal when these conditions exist. {#625}

STRATEGY FOR EMERGENCIES

1. Presently, there is no County Code with respect to solid waste services during or following emergencies. If an "official" emergency is declared, the County has defined emergency plans in place for cleaning up roadways, public spaces and emergency access.. Even if an official emergency is declared, current plans do not address the removal of residential waste or debris on private property.*

*** Correction**

2. What are all the different types and levels of emergencies that impact solid waste collection?

hurricanes

tornado

snowstorm {#629}

Most are weather related and affect different areas in different ways. {#630}

Weather (Acts of God), fire, terror attack {#631}

health issues - uncollected garbage is a health issue, especialy in warm weather. {#632}

Water main breakages or gas explosions {#635}

Severe adverse weather

Mass trauma / casualties (ie terrorist attack, plane crash, multiple motor vehicle accidents)

Bioterrorist attack with County wide medication / vaccine adminstration with biowaste. {#636}

Large hauler going out of business Ref:#632

Flood

Building Collapse {#638}

A catestrophic event at the solid waste manging facilities {#639}

hurricane is #1 with snow/ice #2 {#640}

Remember acts of terrorism may also be included {#642, County Staff}

3. What are the appropriate roles for the COUNTY to fill during EMERGENCIES which have not been declared to be "official?"

Address priorities of public health and safety. Assist in cleanup with equipment and staff if required and extend facility hours for haulers. {#633}

Communication - on website, phones, literature regarding services available and not available. {#637}

Provide disposal free of charge to haulers for emergency related trash/debris. {#641}

Lift restrictions to insure that clean up occurs in order to maintain proper health and welfare of citizens. {#643}

What restrictions?? {#653, Admin/Mgmt}

This could relate to time restrictions. Going into a neighborhood early than 6:00 am. {#670}

#643 restrictions on tipping fees, pick requirements/times, etc {#688}

If they are not going to call it an emergency, provide guidance to haulers and field calls from public. {#645}

define the problem and help the private haulers work together {#647}

Communication {#651}

Provide information to public about self cleanup. Provide disposal at no charge during the emergency. {#661}

Assure disposal facilities are available.

Communication. {#662}

Create a standard for a "solid waste emergency" (similar to the snow emergency declaration used by the transportation department) that would relax service requirements or let the public know that service may be delayed for a day. {#664}

Restrictions as to types of materials that may be brought in for disposal at ERRC and landfill, allowing items not ordinarily allowed. {#672}

Consider setting up Community Emergency Alert Network (CEAN) group to get emergency messages out to a "County/collector/disposer" group. CEAN allows messages via computer, cell phone text messages, etc. {#693, Admin/Mgmt}

4. What are the appropriate roles for HAULERS to fill during EMERGENCIES which have not been declared to be "official?"

Within the framework of existing service agreements provide collection for material which haulers are equipped to handle at additional cost to the consumer which fairly reflects the cost of service provided. {#644}

They should have the means to respond, especially if it involves a health or safety issue (County, too) Perhaps make arrangements with other haulers to cover for them if, for example, equipment breaks down. {#646}

assist the county and other private haulers to get the waste p/u asap {#649}

Do their best at PR by letting their customers know what they will pick up, when, and any special restrictions. It could be done via email or recording on the hauler voice mail. Communication is key {#650}

By and large this would be a time when haulers would want to shine and show they are a part of the community. If the county were to temporarily lift restrictions, it could help to mitigate the situation in a quick fashion. {#652}

What restrictions are you referring to? {#660, Admin/Mgmt}

#660 (answer) lift tipping fees, pick up restrictions (time) {#673}

Handle the customers they service and their needs. {#656}

Communicate with their customers, giving precise options or actions that will be used to achieve performance. {#658}

ditto #644--additional cost if necessary. {#668}

Communicate with their customers.

Clearly define what they will pick up and when.

Provide customers with alternatives they may use, special collection services available. {#671}

5. Should the Task Force develop recommendations for roles and responsibilities when emergencies affect solid waste collection? Why or why not?

No. Each circumstance is most likely unique. A general statement outlining what types of situations that can result in delayed service and how in general a hauler expects they will be able to respond. {#634}

No. This would interfere and conflict with the haulers ability to perform work already contracted. {#648}

No.. this should be between the hauler and their customers. {#667}

yes a frame work for cooperation between the private and public hauling companies should be developed. {#654}

Yes, the task force should recommend that the County be responsible for major clean up and make disposal available, at no charge, to emergency related volumes. {#663}

Yes. Guidelines would be similar to any organization's crisis plan - - how to get service back to level before the emergency. {#659}

Yes. I think the task force should make a recommendation as to what the public can expect, as far as timeliness of collection, but leave implementation to the haulers. {#655}

Yes. These are recommendations, not rules. County and private haulers should meet same recommendations. {#657}

Yes. The most critical role for the county is communicating to the public what their expectation of regular service should be in the case of an emergency. {#669}

Yes. In that a clear understanding of what a hauler will or will not do should be communicated. {#674}

No, not knowing the type or severity of an emergency, haulers cannot determine response times, {#684}

6. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

The public should expect collection within 2 biz days after road clearing in thier neighborhood. Any longer and there should be a hotline to call at the hauler's office. {#665}

ref #665--Some, maybe many. haulers would not have equipment or personnel to handle hauling major debris {#678}

for all haulers to submit at a minimum an equipment list and an estimate of surplus capacity for additional p/u's that could be made for others during emergencies. {#666}

Putting a time limit on a hauler is not feasible. Sometimes it takes weeks for a hauler to clean up the brush and debris from a major storm. Sometimes, due to ice on streets, it can be days before a hauler can access a street or container. {#675}

Garbage should be a primary pickup, with brush not a priority. Response should be as soon as possible without endangering any hauler. Safety and health should be considered first. There usually would be a way to pick up waste. And cooperation among haulers (incl. County) would be appropriate. If it means lowering "restrictions" that should also be considered. The main objective is to get it cleaned up. {#676}

How would you prioritize recyclables? {#686, Admin/Mgmt}

Create a framework for developing a business interruption plan to bring back service to levels prior to incident. {#680}

Only provide for household trash collection; yard debris or recyclables not important in such situations {#681}

The county should develop a system for declaring "solid waste emergencies" that could be communicated to residents through public media. The recommendation could define how long regular service would be delayed, hopefully reducing complaints. {#682}

Minimum service level requirements can be created to meet health and safety needs. Doesn't have to be a full cleanup. {#683}

A dos and don'ts list for emergency debris.

What a hauler will do and what would cost extra.

How the County and haulers could work together to address major emergencies such as in-place contracts for support. {#685}

DECISION:

For both County and private haulers, garbage should be a priority. Brush and recycling pick up is deferred until normal conditions return.

County Role: Coordination and Communication

Haulers Role: Input to County message and planning, provide trash services (not tree and/or disaster services),

REFERRED to Solid Waste Collectors Meeting {#689, FACILITATOR}

SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS

1. Nothing exists today that defines quality standards for customer service for residential collection beyond the minimum Code requirements.

2. Is there a value for haulers to create a voluntary charter for customer service that would set out the services to be provided to customers? Why or why not?

no {#694}

No, not if it is a charter subscribed to by all haulers. Yes, if it is between individual hauler and their customers.

Haulers have statements of service, or service agreements with their customers now. If they are not complying now, a charter agreed to by all haulers will not make a difference. {#708}

no, service levels are set by the individual companies and the market will determine them {#700}

No. The haulers currently service their customers above and beyond the minimum standards as set forth by the county code. {#705}

No. There may be a value, but is it within the perview of this group, since it is a "voluntary charter"? {#701}

The SLA would be helpful in such areas as: how customer calls will be handled, i.e., how long before a call is answered; if v-m, e-m or fax is sent, how long before acknowledgement of receipt and expected time before request will be completed; when might a credit be offered; and what recourse a customer has when a promised action is not kept. {#695}

Absolutely - yes. That value is in keeping their customers {#699}

yes {#696}

Yes, a listing of service level expectations beyond code requirements that a "good" collection company adheres to would be good. {#706}

Yes, it is a good customer retention strategy. {#704}

Yes. I should be able to know that haulers will provide a minimal level of service, so when shopping around for a hauler, it is easier to compare apples to apples. {#702}

Yes.. if there is a clear delineation of household trash, yard debris and brush, as well as recyclables. In addition there should be specifics about what constitutes a "special pick up." {#710}

3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?

No. This is beyond the reach of our charter {#713}

No. {#717}

No. {#719}

No. {#721}

yes with the help of the hauler meetings recommendations {#707}

Yes {#698}

Yes, a standard of expected service would be good. {#720}

Yes, but it should be done by the haulers with full cooperation of all. It is in their best interest to provide this. It sounds as though some have made a good start. {#709}

Yes, it should. {#697}

Yes. Residents need some kind of standard. If haulers don't want to do this voluntarily, let the County set the standards, or take over! {#714}

Yes. {#716}

4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

Incorporate this information in a new customer packet that can part of the HOA packet or available to send a prospect. {#703}

Charge the County staff and Haulers, via the Haulers' meetings with the County, to draft a generic service agreement the County would adopt as a recommendation to all residents.

It would not be mandatory, but haulers would draft the template with the County staff and this could be put on County website that residents could put in front of any hauler.

This benefits the resident by having a minimum level of protection.

It protects the hauler as issues, such as what will be collected and what will not, will be clearly spelled out. It could include service time window, weight limits, bag limits, service minimum guarantees, what to do in the event of an emergency. {#711}

The haulers group meetings with County can produce this and bring to the task force to include in report. {#712}

Haulers and County can do this together and have a media blitz about it. {#715}

REFERRED TO THE COLLECTOR'S MEETING: Conrad Mehan to present and report back to Task Force. {#722, FACILITATOR}

COMPETITION

1. Is there sufficient private COMPETITION in the marketplace to sustain high levels of customer service in Fairfax County? Why or why not?

I don't know but there is never a reason not to sustain high levels of customer service. {#737}

No, some areas of the County do not have sufficient competition, which leads to frustration when poor customer service occurs. {#742}

No. Not all haulers go to all areas of the County {#724}

Some areas there is too much competition, creating traffic/safety problems; Other areas, there is apparently no competition. This hurts customers in those areas who are receiving poor service from the only company servicing there. {#736}

Yes there is sufficient competition to sustain customer service levels. {#728}

yes there is sufficient competition. {#733}

yes, and if in some areas competition is low a company will start up or an existing company will fill the need. {#718}

Yes, there is sufficient competition to sustain customer service levels. {#734}

Yes. Competition produces both winners and losers. With a 1 million strong marketplace (not including commercial), competition is clearly in place. {#739}

yes. overlapping service areas should be avoided where possible. {#740}

Yes. {#726}

2. What are the main issues with respect to ensuring COMPETITION among the private haulers?

maintaining the county run transfer stations and not permitting private transfer stations within the county {#723}

I do not know. Is there a map that shows which haulers do business in which areas? {#725}

Don't understand the question {#730}

Maintaining a level playing field for disposal rates. {#735}

One of the important factors is the county's role in operating the landfill, transfer station, and the burning thing in Lorton -- as this provides a level playing field for all companies (regardless of size) use of these facilities. {#743}

Let the marketplace work with limited government interference. {#745}

Competitive services at competitive prices. {#746}

Ditto, #745 {#748}

No one hauler dominates the market. {#751}

The collectors need to be willing to move into new territories to provide competition even when there are only subscription customers. {#752}

County collection service - whether to expand or limit {#753}

Provide a level playing field. {#756}

3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to this issue? Why or why not?

let the free market work it out. {#727}

If there isn't any in an area, a disgruntled customer has no recourse unless they dispose of their trash directly at the landfill. {#729}

No {#731}

No, market will stabilize by itself. {#738}

no {#744}

No. {#747}

No. Unless it is to maintain the county's role in the processing facilities. {#749}

No {#750}

no. {#757}

No {#758}

4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

No, the market should be the driver of this issue. {#732}

None. {#741}

State that FXCO has a strong marketplace that should be encouraged and nurtured to maintain healthy competition. {#754}

no, open free markets will work any competition issues out over the long run. {#755}

COMMUNICATION

1. County Code requires that collectors communicate with their customers but does not define frequency. Minimal content is currently required (Section 109-4-1(i) of the communication).

2. What are some of the issues with respect to residential waste collection COMMUNICATION?

Not with respect to frequency or content. {#760}

ref#760 Customers generally ignore notices. {#768}

When a customer has a question or concern, they will contact us. All customers are given statement of service as required by County. No other requirement is needed. {#762}

Customer needs clear understanding of:

- a. what service exactly is being paid for and what service is NOT provided
- b. how to communicate with hauler after service started
- c. how to cancel service; get a refund
- d. 30 day minimum written notification of price increase and reason for increase
- e. provide a "tip" on every invoice {#763}

Customers don't read.

Collector's should send out more frequently.

More information than minimum required would help. {#764}

Timely notice of rate increase including the amount of the increase and a requirement for providing multi-lingual versions of the code requirements? {#765}

Customers need to be aware of the menu of priced services and options available. Many probably do not specify in contracts with haulers. {#770}

Customers need to know what services the hauler does and does not provide. Haulers should be responsible for this. County should and can't intervene in a private contractual relationship.

Customers need a more user friendly way to understand the code, requirements, common issues between the haulers, etc. No resident is going to access the code. If there was a user friendly web site link to some kind of 'industry guideline', it would eliminate a lot of questions, and frustration for all parties concerned. Haulers could link to the county website, have their fax numbers on the County site. Haulers could, if they choose, put their service agreements on the County website. {#772}

#772 good answer. {#777}

Communication is key to keeping the customer informed. If the hauler had an automated message system for announcements such as missed pick ups, holiday changes, x-mas tree pick up etc. it would avoid confusion with customers.

Even if folks glance at the information sent to them, the company is making an effort to keep them informed. Information is key. Many of the calls to the Supervisors offices could have been mitigated by haulers keeping their customers informed of changes, upgrades, etc. {#774}

All communications as it relates to the scope of services should be communicated to customers prior to service commencing {#775}

3. Does the Task Force want to make a recommendation with respect to the frequency or content of COMMUNICATIONS between customers and haulers? Why or why not?

No, but regulation should be enforced. {#773}

No, County Code is sufficient. {#779}

No, not necessary. {#767}

No. The code covers this sufficiently. {#766}

No. Standards are already in County code. {#761}

No. {#759}

Not if there are sufficient standards or requirements in the permit process {#781}

It seems to be in the haulers' (and County's) best interest to communicate as often as possible. Getting customers to read and remember is another story. County sends out a booklet every year re their services, policies, etc. and most people (in my community) don't even look at it. They don't even read what we put in the newsletter. {#769}

Yes, standards in County Code are not sufficient. More detail and minimum frequency required. {#771}

Yes, I would recommend comments 763 and 772 from #2 {#784}

Yes, something needs to change as this was an issue the Board endorsed as needing attention. {#788}

4. If so, what should the Task Force recommendation be?

Enforce regulation. {#776}

The recommendations should be more detailed on every aspect of service and the frequency should be sent out at least annually. {#778}

Enforce County Code. {#780}

Make sure that the customer base is aware of various services, requirements, standards etc. {#783}

Enforce the County Code. {#785}

Yes, both 763 and 772 could be combined and handed to the hauler task force and a citizen appointee. The hauler group has committed to try and come up with a standard or industry reference document to post on the County website. A communication parameter could be added to this industry guideline. {#791}

OTHER ISSUES

1. What other issues, areas or focus of interest that this Task Force needs to consider while we have access to the GDSC?

What is the appropriate role of the county in solid waste management over the next twenty years. {#798}

What are the consequences of the county not providing direct resident solid waste services? {#799}

We haven't addressed how a company that is not performing up to minimal standards required by county code is dealt with. What can be done to require their compliance in order to avoid draconian action by the BOS. {#800}

To define the precise role of the county in the trash collection business - procurement, oversight, selecting haulers for districts, park-outs, public buildings etc. {#801}

Are there enough haulers to pick up the slack if the County gets out of the business and/or are the current ones prepared to grow to handle this? {#802}

I would like to see the Task Force focus on the following:

1. What can be done by those in the room who provide collection services to decrease emissions within the next five years.
2. What can be done to increase the safety of the citizens while collection trucks are in the neighborhoods?
3. What can be done to increase the amount of recycling by private citizens in regard to curbside pick up.?
4. What can be done to control the amount of hazardous material in household collections? ie NiCAD batt, florescent bulbs, etc. {#803, Other Attendee}

The goal of this group is to a little or do a lot, but certainly we can't do nothing. We need to do something really forward thinking. We need to build for the future, such as significantly increasing the capacity of the E/RRF, i.e., double its size. We need to act like the folks that were forward thinking in the 1980's that first saw the vision for building the facility.

This issue is beyond the trash left behind by various hauler, the size of yard debris, or paper vs. plastic. It is critical to managing a county on its way to 2 million citizens. {#804}

ditto to #800 {#805}

Yes, we are not thinking as far ahead as we should be - 20 years. {#806}

No real recommendations on service quality, This was the main reason for group. Can be through a code change or less preferably through a voluntary program. {#807}

#802 is a key question. {#808}

What incentive is there to provide good service? Can the County pull a lic. to operate if there is no quality service? {#809, Other Attendee}

Comment to #804 - The SWMP approved by the BOS did not call for increasing the size of the E/RRF. With current air regulations it would be nearly impossible to expand the facility - as northern virginia is in an area that would make that nearly impossible. {#810, County Staff}

Level palying fields for small haulers to compete for county contracts. County permitting and bonding. Sanitation districts. {#812}

**** FEEDBACK ***

1. WHAT WENT WELL TONIGHT?

we are reaching decisions. {#811}

Good discussions. {#814}

The system is moving us through more questions {#816}

Not a lot. Last meeting was more rewarding as far as the amount of work finished. {#824, Other Attendee}

Good discussion, although there were time constraints that prevented complete resolution {#826}

No changes, same jargan. {#830}

2. WHAT DIDN'T GO WELL?

Sometimes, one group tends to entrench itself and not listen to any other viewpoints. {#813}

Too much time spent on discussing minutia. Not really focused tonight compared to last meeting. {#815, Other Attendee}

Not enough decisions. {#817}

Too much posturing, less coming together for consensus. Less voting {#820}

I think we got a bit off track and spent too much time on issues that were already pretty much in effect. {#821}

We aren't reaching decisions. Just passing the buck. {#822}

Too much "off the system" commentary and additional discussion after the system had indicated a clear consensus. {#823}

A lack of responsibility to the real issue. Ditto buck passing. {#827}

Need more facilitation, more forcing us to face decision making. {#831}

3. WHAT DO YOU WANT TO CHANGE FOR NEXT MEETING?

Move the discussion along faster. More yes/no items. {#818, Other Attendee}

I think this process is extremely more efficient compared to those early sessions.

This process forces us to move along and make decisions. {#819}

Answer questions. Find an issue to vote upon. Take a vote. {#825}

Rephrasing some questions as we did at the very end was a good step forward. {#828}

Maximize time spent on new business, less on old detail. {#829}

More decisions through the system which encourages a yes/no response. A reinforcing up/down vote helps summarize the recommendation. {#832}

Deal with the issues and move on. Stop finger pointing and let's resolve some issues. {#837}

Individual comments are not treated equally. Some comments are being discounted without due discussion if the speaker isn't forceful, while others are allowed to take control of the floor. {#838}

Non-haulers need a little more factual background to adequately address operational issues. {#840}

Re: 818. Yes/no items "frame" the issue and suggest the response. While the need to move forward is important, we also need balance since these are important issues that we will be living with for a long time. Sometimes, thinking outside the box is good. Like the open-ended question "what are we missing?" {#841, Admin/Mgmt}

4. OTHER COMMENTS?

Limit on line discussion. We are wasting too much time in off line discussion. While it is sometimes beneficial for that, the personalities in the room were and are too combative for much off line discussion. This is how it got to this, folks not willing to work out things before the BOS got involved. {#833, Other Attendee}

This is far better than where we were before. {#834}

Chocolate chip cookies would be nice. {#835}

I suggest all participants read: the BOS mandate, the original 20 year plan, Sect. 109 (codes) before the next meeting so we can keep on track. {#836}

Provide us with questions ahead of the meeting, so we come prepared to answer? {#839}

Leave room for opinion other than staff coerced. {#842}

Opinion Meter (2 Issues)

Communication

Does the Task Force want to recommend that customers be able to contact a hauler and get a response within a 24 hour period?

Group Results

Number of votes: 11

Yes%: 81.82 No%: 18.18

Yes - 9

No - 2

Second Version

Recommend that customers are able to contact the County and private haulers during normal business hours and get a response within one business day?

Group Results

Number of votes: 10

Yes%: 100.00 No%: 0.00

Yes - 10

No - 0